

# A Blind Study of Pesticide Residues in Spiked and Unspiked Fruit Extracts Using Deconvolution Reporting Software Application

Food

## Author

Christopher P. Sandy  
Agilent Technologies, Inc.  
Block A, CSC Eskdale Road  
Winnersh Triangle Estate  
Wokingham, Berk RG41 5DZ  
United Kingdom

## Abstract

The Agilent Technologies mass selective detector (MSD) coupled with deconvolution reporting software (DRS) provides additional powerful data processing capabilities to the MSD ChemStation software. Reviewing full scan gas chromatography/mass spectrometry data for the confirmation of pesticide residues can be a labor-intensive and time-consuming process requiring great skill and concentration by an experienced analyst. The DRS is able to process a complex food extract total ion chromatogram in about 1 minute, whereas an experienced analyst may take more than 30 minutes to achieve the same quality result. Extensive data shown in this report supports the high confidence level that an analyst can have in results rapidly produced by the DRS.

## Introduction

Typical mass spectral pesticide residue analysis requires finding target ions and meeting qualifier

ion ratios. It is sometimes very difficult to confirm target compounds from high matrix background because the matrix affects the ion ratios of the target compounds or complicates the spectrum with additional ions. To be certain of the results, background subtraction and manual integration are often practiced. It is, therefore, a time-consuming process to confirm target compounds in a dirty matrix. It can take an experienced analyst 15 to 30 minutes to review/confirm one data file.

Two powerful gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) techniques - Retention Time Locking (RTL) and deconvolution were combined to create a quantitation and screening tool that can identify 567 pesticides and endocrine disrupters from a single run in 1-2 minutes. The Agilent Technologies GC/MSD-DRS provides the additional functionality to the MSD ChemStation.


## Experimental

### DRS Overview

A detailed overview of the DRS is given in an application note 5989-1157EN [1], available for download at [www.agilent.com/chem](http://www.agilent.com/chem). The operating principles of the DRS appear in Figure 1.



Agilent Technologies



**Figure 1. Schematic diagram summarizing the GC/MS DRS.**

The quantitation capabilities of the MSD ChemStation are combined with the deconvolution power of the industry standard AMDIS program from NIST. AMDIS is able to separate spectra of interest from dirty matrix spectra present in samples analyzed for pesticides. A third level of confidence is obtained by sending the deconvoluted spectra for library searches of the NIST02 145,000 compound library. A comprehensive report is produced in about 1 minute.

### Samples

Six samples of fruit extracts, supplied in 90/10 iso-octane/toluene solvent were received for analysis by GC/MS. The samples were prepared by an accredited food pesticide laboratory based in Scandinavia. Three of the samples were spiked with a number of pesticides at varying concentration levels. Although the range of concentrations of the pesticides in each sample was given, **neither the actual number of pesticides** spiked into each control sample **nor the identities** were supplied. Details of the samples appear in Table 1. The other three samples were 'real', unspiked extracts.

**Table 1. Sample Details for Blind Study**

Sample number	Matrix extracted	Number of pesticides	Concn range (mg/Kg)	Comments
1	Orange	20–40	0.02–0.20	Control sample - spiked
2	Lettuce	20–40	0.02–0.20	Control sample - spiked
3	Apple	20–40	0.01–0.20	Control sample - spiked
4	Grapes	2–4	0.1–1.0	Real sample
5	Orange	2–4	0.2–5.0	Real sample
6	Apple	2–4	0.05–2.0	Real sample

## Instrumentation

The samples were analyzed by full-scan GC/MS using the analytical conditions given in Table 2. Data processing and reporting were performed using the default settings provided with the DRS.

**Table 2. RTL GC/MS Analysis Conditions for Fruit Extract Samples**

<b>Gas chromatograph</b>	<b>Agilent 6890N</b>
Column	30 m x 0.25 mm id x 0.25 µm HP-5MS (p/n 19091S-433)
Carrier gas	Helium
Flow rate	1.9 mL/min at 70 °C
Head pressure	18 psig, constant pressure mode Method RTLocked to methyl chlorpyrifos at 16.593 min
Injector type	PTV, septumless head
Injector temperature (°C), hold time (min), and ramp rate (°C/min)	90 °C (0.3 min) - 1720 °C/min - 250 °C
Vent time	0.2 min
Vent flow	30 mL/min
Vent pressure	0 psig
Purge flow	60 mL/min
Purge time	1.0 min
Syringe volume	50 µL
Injection volume	15 µL
Liner	Empty multibaffle
Oven program: temperature (°C), hold time (min), and ramp rate (°C/min)	70(2)-25-150(0)-3-200(0)-8-280(10)
<b>MSD</b>	<b>Agilent 5973 inert</b>
MS interface	280 °C
MS source	230 °C
MS quad	150 °C
Detection mode	El, Scan 40–550 amu
EM voltage	ATUNE value

## Results

The results for the three spiked extracts appear in Table 3 - note that the details of which pesticides were added to the spiked samples were not supplied until after the results were shown to the customer. Those pesticides confirmed by the DRS, are shown lightly shaded. The analytes, shown darkly shaded, are not present in the Agilent RTL Pesticides database. Analyte entries left unshaded were not confirmed.

**Table 3. MSD-DRS Results for Three Spiked Fruit Extract Samples**

<b>Sample 1: Control-orange, spiked</b>			<b>Sample 2: Control-lettuce, spiked</b>		<b>Sample 3: Control- apple, spiked</b>	
Pesticide	Added mg/kg		Pesticide	Added mg/kg	Pesticide	Added mg/kg
1 Methamidofos*	0.10		Diphenylamine	0.10	Mevinphos	0.05
2 Dichlorvos*	0.10		HCB	0.02	Trichlorfon	0.05
3 Acephate*	0.10		Lindane (HCH-gamma)	0.04	Heptenophos	0.02
4 Omethoate	0.10		Diazinon	0.04	Tecnazene	0.01
5 Propachlor	0.20		Chlortalonil	0.04	HCH alpha	0.01
6 Chlorprofam	0.10		Vinclozolin	0.04	HCH beta	0.02
7 Monocrotophos	0.10		Carbaryl	0.20	Dichloran	0.05
8 Dimethoate	0.04		Metalaxyl	0.10	Pyrimethanil	0.02
9 Quintozone	0.02		Pirimiphos-methyl	0.10	Etrimphos	0.02
10 Parathion-methyl	0.10		Malathion	0.10	Ethiofencarb	0.10
11 Dichlofluanid	0.10		Chlorpyrifos	0.10	Metribuzin	0.05
12 Fenpropimorph	0.10		Cyprodinil	0.04	Toclophos methyl	0.01
13 Triadimefon	0.04		Penconazole	0.04	Linuron	0.05
14 Thiabendazole	0.10		Captan	0.10	Aldrin	0.02
15 Tolyfluanid	0.04		Folpet**	0.10	Diethofencarb	0.02
16 Mecarbam	0.10		Procymidone	0.04	Trichloronate	0.02
17 Methidation	0.10		Endosulfan-a	0.04	Triadimenol	0.05
18 Vamidothion	0.10		pp-DDE	0.04	Disulfoton sulfoxide	0.20
19 Imazalil	0.10		Bupirimate	0.04	Disulfoton sulfone	0.02
20 Myclobutanil	0.10		Endosulfan-b	0.04	Fluazinam	0.05
21 Kresoxim methyl	0.10		Aclonifen	0.04	Chlorbenzilate	0.05
22 Tebuconazole	0.10		Ethion	0.04	Oxadixyl	0.05
23 Phosmet	0.10		Triazophos	0.04	Benalaxyl	0.05
24 Fenpropathrin	0.04		Endosulfan-sulfate	0.04	Dicofol	0.05
25 Tetradifon	0.04		Iprodione	0.04	Fenazaquin	0.02
26 Azinphos-methyl	0.10		Bromopropylate	0.10	Pyrazophos	0.05
27 Fenarimol	0.10		Methoxychlor	0.10	Acrinathrin	0.02
28 Azinpfos-ethyl	0.10		Phosalone	0.10	Bitertanol	0.05
29 Prochloraz	0.10		Lambda-Cyhalothrin	0.04	Cyfluthrin beta	0.05
30 Flucythrinate	0.10		Permethrin	0.10	Alpha cypermethrin	0.05
31 Esfenvalerate	0.04		Cypermethrin	0.10		
32 Azoxystrobin	0.04		Fenvalerate	0.04		
33			Deltamethrin	0.10		

\* See Discussion item 1.

\*\* See Discussion item 2.

The results for the three ‘real’ extracts appear in Table 4. Those pesticides confirmed by the DRS are shown lightly shaded. The darkly-shaded analytes are not present in the Agilent RTL Pesticides database. Analyte entries left unshaded were not confirmed. Analytes with an associated concentration were confirmed as present by the customer using NPD/ECD. Lightly-shaded analytes without a concentration label were detected and confirmed by the DRS, but not by the customer.

**Table 4. MSD-DRS Results for Three ‘Real’ Fruit Extract Samples**

<b>Sample 4: Grapes</b>	
0.68 mg/Kg Captan	
0.21 mg/Kg Cyprodinil	
0.27 mg/Kg Fludioxinil	
Diphenylamine	
<b>Sample 5: Orange</b>	
2.5 mg/Kg Imazalil	
0.25 mg/Kg Medidathion	
3.0 mg/Kg Thiabendazole	
<b>Sample 6: Apple</b>	
0.86 mg/Kg Diphenylamine	
0.05 mg/Kg Chlorpyrifos	
0.79 mg/Kg Thiabendazole	
Dimethoate	
Ethoxyquin	
Methyl parathion	
Endosulfan sulfate	
Propargite	

## Discussion

### 1. Control - Orange spiked extract

This control sample was spiked with 32 pesticides at levels ranging between 0.02 and 0.10 mg/kg. Twenty-six pesticides were detected and confirmed by the DRS software, two were not reported since they are not present in the Agilent RTL Pesticide database and four were not detected. The spiking was done to the raw matrix, not to a matrix extract. For the polar pesticides (methamidofos and acephate), the recovery was in the 20%–30% range as confirmed by NPD/ECD. Therefore, that explains why these pesticides were not detected by DRS.

### 2. Control - Lettuce spiked extract

This control sample was spiked with 33 pesticides at levels ranging between 0.02 and 0.20 mg/kg. Twenty-nine pesticides were detected and confirmed by the DRS software, three were not reported since they are not present in the Agilent RTL Pesticide database and one was not detected. The one undetected analyte, (Folpet, marked with two asterisks in Table 3), was detected and confirmed if a higher sensitivity setting was used in the AMDIS deconvolution program.

### 3. Control - Apple spiked extract

This control sample was spiked with 30 pesticides at levels ranging between 0.01 and 0.20 mg/kg. Twenty-two pesticides were detected and confirmed by the DRS software, six were not reported since they are not present in the Agilent RTL Pesticide database and two were not detected.

Overall, of the 95 spiked analytes in the three control samples, 93% of the pesticides present in the Agilent RTL Pesticide database were detected and confirmed by full-scan library searching of the deconvoluted mass spectra.

### 4. ‘Real’ Grape extract

The customer had detected and confirmed three pesticide residues in the Grape extract sample - Captan, Cyprodinil, and Fludioxinil. Of these three analytes, Captan was confirmed by the DRS and Cyprodinil and Fludioxinil are not entries in the Agilent RTL Pesticide database. However, DRS also confirmed an additional pesticide residue - Diphenylamine, which was not reported by the customer.

### 5. ‘Real’ Orange extract

The customer had detected and confirmed three pesticide residues in the Orange extract sample - Imazilil, Methidathion, and Thiabendazole. All three of these pesticides were confirmed by the DRS software and no other analytes were confirmed.

## 6. 'Real' Apple extract

The customer had detected and confirmed three pesticide residues in the Apple extract sample - Diphenylamine, Chlorpyrifos, and Thiabendazole. All three of these pesticides were confirmed by the DRS. In addition, the DRS also confirmed the presence of five additional pesticide residues - Dimethoate, Ethoxyquin, Methyl Parathion, Endosulfan Sulfate, and Prochloraz. These five pesticides had not been reported by the customer.

## Conclusions

The Agilent Technologies MSD-DRS provides additional powerful data processing capabilities to the MSD ChemStation software. Reviewing full scan GC/MS data for the confirmation of pesticide residues can be a labor-intensive and time consuming process requiring great skill and concentration by an experienced analyst.

The DRS is able to process a complex food extract TIC in the order of 1 minute, whereas an experienced analyst may take more than 30 minutes to achieve the same quality result. The DRS software was proven to report the lowest number of false positives and false negatives in the shortest time period.

In scan mode, the detection limit is not as low as in selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode; however, any prior knowledge of the target analytes (retention times or characteristic ions) is not required for the DRS.

The extensive data shown in this report, run under totally blind conditions, shows the high degree of confidence that an analyst can have in the results produced by the DRS in minutes.

## Reference

1. Philip L. Wylie, Michael J. Szelewski, Chin-Kai Meng, and Christopher P. Sandy, "Comprehensive Pesticide Screening by GC/MSD Using Deconvolution Reporting Software", Agilent Technologies, publication 5989-1157EN, [www.agilent.com/chem](http://www.agilent.com/chem)

## For More Information

For more information on our products and services, visit our Web site at [www.agilent.com/chem](http://www.agilent.com/chem).

Agilent shall not be liable for errors contained herein or for incidental or consequential damages in connection with the furnishing, performance, or use of this material.

Information, descriptions, and specifications in this publication are subject to change without notice.

© Agilent Technologies, Inc. 2004

Printed in the USA  
October 5, 2004  
5989-1654EN

